

3- Dist Policy
Quind 55

5th February, 1960.

COCOM Document 3715.01/4B

COORDINATING COMMITTEE

RECORD OF DISCUSSION

ON

ITEM 1501 - COMMUNICATIONS, NAVIGATION, DIRECTION FINDING

AND RADAR EQUIPMENT

25th January 1960

Present: Belgium(Luxembourg), Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan,
Netherlands, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States.

References: COCOM Docs. Nos. 3700.1, 2 and 5, 3715.00/1, 3715.01/1 - 3 and
W.P. 1501/1 - 6.

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to resume discussion on Item 1501 and stressed that the present round of discussion would be the last attempt to reach unanimous agreement on five important items in the Electronics Category. He noted that the Committee would follow its normal practice of studying these items in numerical order, but recalled that the French and Netherlands Delegations (COCOM Doc. No. 3715.01/3, paras. 5 and 6) held the view that the solutions adopted for each of these five items should be closely linked. The Chairman finally drew the Committee's attention to the proposal just made by the United States Delegation (W.P. 1501/6) and invited views thereon.

2. The UNITED STATES Delegate introduced the following proposal:

"The United States Delegation could accept the following solution for parts (b) and (e) of Item 1501: to have the following Notes, as the only Notes to these parts of the definition:

For 1501 (b): Note: Governments may permit as administrative exceptions the export of the following equipment in a non-transistorised form provided they are satisfied that the equipment is to be installed in civil aircraft of the Sino-Soviet Bloc and is in normal civil use:

- A. VOR
- B. ILS
- C. DME
- D. Commercial airborne equipment designed to make use of hyperbolic grids based on the constant velocity and/or rectilinear propagation characteristics of electro-magnetic waves of frequencies less than 3 megacycles per second.

This Note as applied to (C) and (D) is valid for the year 1960. It will be considered to be extended for a further year if, in the course of the 1960 List Review, no delegation objects to its continuation.

The licensing of such exports should be reported to the Committee in the monthly statistics.

For 1501 (e): Note: Governments may permit as administrative exceptions the export of the following equipment in a non-transistorised form provided they are satisfied that the equipment is to be installed at civilian airports or for use on civilian air routes in the Sino-Soviet Bloc and is in normal civil use:

- A. VOR
- B. ILS
- C. DME
- D. Ground equipment for use with commercial airborne equipment designed to make use of hyperbolic grids based on the constant velocity and/or rectilinear propagation characteristics of electro-magnetic waves of frequencies less than 3 megacycles per second.

This Note as applied to (C) and (D) is valid for the year 1960. It will be considered to be extended for a further year if, in the course of the 1960 List Review, no Delegation objects to its continuation.

The licensing of such exports should be reported to the Committee in the monthly statistics.

3. The Delegate stressed that this proposal resulted from an exhaustive analysis of the technical and strategic aspects of Item 1501. It was an important step towards meeting the views of other delegations. Proceeding from the agreements already reached especially as far as the administrative exceptions formula was concerned, the United States Delegation were now reluctantly contemplating the extension of this administrative exceptions procedure to the equipment covered by sub-items C and D, for which there was a further stipulation as to the renewal of this procedure at the end of one year.
4. The GERMAN Delegate appreciated the compromise effort reflected in the United States proposal, and expressed the hope that the same spirit would be apparent when studying Items 1520, 1523 and 1526. Noting that the new United States proposal called for the reporting of licences in the monthly statistics, the Delegate felt that the other Notes to Item 1501, which at present referred to "shipments", should be made uniform in this respect.
5. The TURKISH Delegate stated that the solution proposed by the United States Delegation seemed to him to be a fair compromise, and that his Delegation were able to agree to it.
6. The UNITED KINGDOM Delegate noted that it was the practice of the Committee to adopt different exception techniques depending on the scope of the exception concerned. Thus within Item 1501 alone, there was a variety of exception systems according to the equipment involved. The United Kingdom Delegation joined the German and Turkish Delegations in welcoming the United States initiative. Noting that the United States proposal set up a special rule providing all the flexibility and safeguards desirable, the Delegate stated that the Notes just proposed satisfactorily defined the scope of the exception rule. For their part, the United Kingdom Delegation did not believe it necessary to distinguish between transistorised and non-transistorised equipment, but this minor point detracted nothing from the United States proposal. In view of the effort made by the United States Delegation, his Delegation were ready to agree to this proposal and recommended its adoption by the Committee.
7. As to part B of the Note to sub-item (a) of the definition set out in the Annex to COCOM Doc. No. 3715.01/3, the United Kingdom Delegation proposed that the following sentence be added:

"The Committee will consider requests by Government to treat as falling within the scope of this rule specified equipments which, although not having been in use for more than two years, are of equivalent characteristics and performance to equipments covered by this rule."

Lastly the Delegate explained that, with respect to sub-item (d)(5), his Delegation's experts proposed the following new wording:

"Ground direction finding equipment other than loop systems or systems employing a number of vertical aerials uniformly disposed around the circumference of a circle."

8. The FRENCH Delegate took note of the effort made by the United States Delegation. Referring to the Chairman's introductory remarks, the Delegate confirmed that he had very firm instructions as to the placing of Item 1501 under a form of control similar to that which would be adopted in the case of Items 1520, 1523 and 1526, since its strategic value was at least equal to theirs. In this connexion he referred to the statement he had made in para. 5 of COCOM Doc. No. 3715.01/3. The United States proposal to set up a system of exceptions for a trial period of one year certainly appeared interesting in so far as it would be equally applicable to the other three items under consideration in the Electronics Category. The new proposal, which was doubtless an important compromise and provided an interesting basis for study, would be transmitted to the French authorities. In reply to the German Delegate's suggestion to substitute the word "licences" for the word "shipments" in all the Notes to Item 1501, the Delegate was at present unable to agree to this proposal. Turning lastly to the wording suggested by the United Kingdom Delegation for sub-item (d)(5), he was not in favour of this text at first sight, since he believed it might appear to apply in the case of TACAN equipment.
9. In reply to the French Delegate's last comment, the COMMITTEE agreed that TACAN equipment could not be regarded as falling under any of the exclusion clauses appearing in the definition of Item 1501.
10. The ITALIAN Delegate stated that he would recommend the latest United States proposal to his Government. He was happy to see that this proposal adopted the principle of a trial period for the application of an administrative exceptions system, and suggested that this method might perhaps be adopted for other items in the Electronics Category.
11. The NETHERLANDS Delegate appreciated the United States Delegation's efforts and, with the hope that unanimous agreement would soon be reached, stated that his Delegation were ready in the same spirit of compromise to agree to the latest proposal before the Committee.
12. The GERMAN Delegate undertook to recommend that his authorities consider accepting the United States Delegation's compromise solution.
13. The CANADIAN Delegate was ready to agree to the United States proposal if it met with unanimous agreement.
14. The JAPANESE Delegate paid tribute to the effort made in the United States proposal, and undertook to recommend the latter to his Government.
15. The BELGIAN Delegate undertook to recommend the United States proposal to his authorities.
16. The UNITED STATES Delegate was glad to see that his Government's compromise solution had been favourably received. In connexion with the minor points raised by some of his colleagues, he first referred to the German Delegate's suggestion to generalise the use of the word "licences" in the various Notes to Item 1501. He could agree to this suggestion, but thought it should be dealt with later once this question had been studied as a whole. Turning next to the United Kingdom proposal to add wording to part B of the Note to sub-item (a), the Delegate found this addition to be compatible with his Government's point of view and could accept the principle, though some editorial change might be necessary in order to include the safeguarding of technological know-how. The Delegate finally agreed ad referendum to the definition proposed by the United Kingdom Delegation for sub-item (d)(5). As to the possibility of which mention had been made of linking the control applied to Item 1501 with that applied to other items in the same Category, the Delegate stressed that even if several items were similar from the strategic point of view, the United States Government and Delegation had always adhered to the principle of treating each item separately.

SECRET

- 4 -

COCOM Document 3715.01/4B

17. The GERMAN Delegate referred to the United Kingdom proposal for sub-item (d)(5) and suggested a slight change in presentation, to which the United Kingdom Delegate agreed. This sub-item would thus read:

"Ground direction finding equipment, except:

- (i) loop systems
- (ii) systems employing a number of vertical aerials uniformly disposed around the circumference of a circle."

18. The COMMITTEE agreed to resume and conclude discussion on the 28th January, at which time several delegations were to give views on the last United States proposal in its entirety, as set out in paragraph 2 above, and all delegations were to give views on the United Kingdom proposal in paragraph 7 above, as well as on the United Kingdom proposal amended by the German Delegation in paragraph 17 above.

S E C R E T